

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,294	09/05/2006	Paul Kelley	29953-227807	5042
26694 VENABLE L	7590 10/27/2008 P		EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 34385 WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998			TAWFIK, SAMEH	
WASHINGTO	JN, DC 20043-9998		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3721	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/27/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/566,294 KELLEY ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit Sameh H. Tawfik 3721 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2008. 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-5,9,10,12-16,19,21,23-27 and 30-54 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-16.19.21.23-27 and 30-54 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-5,9,10 and 12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abevance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

Application/Control Number: 10/566,294 Page 2

Art Unit: 3721

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group I (claims 1-5, 9, 10, and 12) in the reply filed on 10/06/2008 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-5, 9, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 4; "a simplified surface" is vague and indefinite as it is not clear what applicants are referring to by the claimed "simplified surface"? etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Copland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,684,025).

Application/Control Number: 10/566,294

Art Unit: 3721

Copland discloses a system for processing a container comprising means for filling (Fig. 1; via 21); means for capping (via 52 covering the container); means for transporting through the production line (it is inherent that the formed container is moving through the production line via some-type of driving means); means for supporting during the transportation (via roller 16 and machine frame); means for cooling the container body filled with the hot product (Figs. 1 and 2; via atmospheric temperature); means for pushing a projection extending from the cooled container (Figs. 2-7; via uneven shaped/projection container 30; shaping/pusher die 64).

Regarding claim 2: it is inherent while the hot container being cooled (via atmospheric temperature) some kind of vacuuming will be caused within the container due to the different between the inner and outer temperatures.

Regarding claim 5: the container body is conveyed by its neck during the filling and capping (Fig. 1; via the container conveyed through the filling and capping stations); note the upper portion of the container could be consider as the neck.

Regarding claim 9: the means for pushing the projection and it's panels extending from the container body into the interior of the container body (Figs. 5 and 6).

Regarding claim 10: the container body has a grip portion free of structural geometry (Fig. 2; via upper portion of the container).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/566,294

Art Unit: 3721

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Copland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,684,025) in view of Hiroaki (Japanese Publication No. 63-189224).

Copland does not disclose the use of blow molding to form the container. However, Hiroaki discloses a similar formed container with the use of blow molding with means for inverting the projection extending from the container body into the interior of the container prior to the filling (Figs. 2-7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have substituted Copland's forming station with the use of blow molding station, as suggested by Hiroaki, in order to simplify the forming step and come up with different shape of the container.

Alternatively, the examiner takes an official notice that the use of blow molding to form plastic containers is old, well known, and available in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have substituted Copland's forming station with the use of blow molding station, as a matter of engineering design choice, to simplify the forming step and come up with different shape of the container.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sameh H. Tawfik whose telephone number is 571-272-4470. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday - Friday from 9:00 AM to 7:30 PM.

Art Unit: 3721

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada can be reached on 571-272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sameh H. Tawfik/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3721